

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended without adding new matter, and claim 7 has been canceled. The remarks below in response to claim rejections refer to claims as amended herein. Claims 1-6 and 8-49 remain pending.

Claim Objections

Claim 13 has been objected to for reciting “the method of claim 0” instead of “the method of claim 6.” Applicant notes that originally filed claim 13 depended from claim 6 and that the recitation of “claim 0” resulted from an inadvertent auto-numbering error in the amendment filed September 25, 2006, and not from an intentional amendment. Applicant has corrected claim 13 to restore the original dependency from claim 6 and has accordingly marked the status of claim 13 as “original.”

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,142,167 to Temple et al. (“Temple”). Applicant submits that claims 1-3 are not anticipated by Temple.

Claim 1 recites, in part:

encoding data values represented by sets of N bits to produce corresponding sets of M symbols, each of the symbols to be transmitted on a respective signal conductor of the multi-conductor signal path and representing a plurality of bits, and each set of M symbols being selected to produce a current flow within a predetermined range of current flows

Temple discloses a 3/6 binary code for communicating between integrated circuit chips (Temple, col. 3, lines 17-19) and more particularly that the code uses six bits to represent the sixteen hex code digits (otherwise represented by 4-bit values) used for computer instructions (Temple, col. 3, lines 19-20; Figure 3A), and then transmitting each of the six bits on a respective output of a chip 100 (Temple, Figure 2). Thus, assuming *arguendo* that each six-bit hex-code value of Temple constitutes a “symbol,” as posited in the Office Action, Temple does not disclose or suggest that each of the symbols is “to be transmitted on a respective signal conductor of the multi-conductor

signal path” as recited in claim 1. To the contrary, Temple clearly discloses that constituent bits of each six-bit hex-code value are output at respective pins to separate lines of a bus 50 (see, for example, Temple, Figure 2 showing six outputs coupled to bus 50 and col. 3, lines 37-42, describing the high overhead pin count of the six-bit code). In view of this clear distinction, applicant submits that Temple does not anticipate claim 1, nor claims 2 and 3 which depend from and further limit claim 1.

Claims 1 and 3-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,005,895 to Perino et al. (“Perino”). Applicant submits that claims 1 and 3-5 are not anticipated by Perino.

Claim 1 recites, in part:

encoding data values represented by sets of N bits to produce corresponding sets of M symbols, each of the symbols to be transmitted on a respective signal conductor of the multi-conductor signal path and representing a plurality of bits, and each set of M symbols being selected to produce a current flow within a predetermined range of current flows

Perino discloses a signaling system that uses multiple conductors to transmit symbols from source to destination, with each symbol represented by a particular combination of current values provided on each of three conductors (Perino, col. 3, lines 36-53). Accordingly, Perino does not disclose or suggest that each of the symbols is “to be transmitted on a respective signal conductor of the multi-conductor signal path” as recited in claim 1. In view of this clear distinction, applicant submits that Perino does not anticipate claim 1, nor claims 3-5 which depend from and further limit claim 1.

Claims 6 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,521,274 to Sawai (“Sawai”). Applicant has amended claim 6 as discussed below and respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 6 and 8 is moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawai. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 10 and 13 is moot in view of the amendment of claim 6 from which claims 10 and 13 depend.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges that claims 14-49 are allowed.

Applicant also acknowledges that claims 7, 9, 11 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objections set forth in the Office Action. Applicant has amended independent claim 6 to include the limitation of claim 7 (and canceling claim 7), thus effectively rewriting claim 7 in independent form, though numbered as claim 6. Applicant submits that independent claim 6 and dependent claims 8-13 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. If a telephone interview would be helpful in any way, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

A petition for a one (1) month extension of time is enclosed herewith.

An information disclosure statement is also enclosed herewith.

Authorization is hereby given to charge deposit account 501914 for any fee deficiency associated with this submission.

Respectfully submitted,

SHEMWELL MAHAMEDI LLP



Charles E. Shemwell, Reg. No. 40,171
Tel. 408-236-6645

Date April 28, 2006